

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 10-12, 14 and 18-22 are pending. Claims 1, 4, 5, 12 and 21 are independent. By this Amendment, the independent claims are amended.

Support for the amendments can be found, for example, in paragraphs [0006], [0007], [0052] and [0062] of the specification as filed. No new matter is added.

The Office Action's rejection of the pending claims under 35 U.S.C. §112 is obviated by the above amendments, as the features are issue are removed from the claims. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects Claims 1, 4, 5, 10, 12, 18 and 20-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0007173 A1 to Nishide et al. ("Nishide") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0063305 A1 to McIntyre, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,104,489 to Shima et al. ("Shima") and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0124243 A1 to Broeksteeg et al. ("Broeksteeg"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 1 is amended to define that the default setup modifying unit executes a **default setup process** in which the default setup modifying unit modifies the multiple items of the default setting to create a modified default setting set forth in the single default setup command when the single default setup command is included in the printing job, and that the printing unit prints the test print image data included in the printing job **during the default setup process**.

Independent Claims 4, 5, 12 and 21 are similarly amended.

As a result of the claimed configuration, the default setup process and the printing of the test print image data can occur simultaneously (see paragraphs

[0006], [0007], [0052] and [0062] of the specification as filed). Thus, the modified default setup becomes valid simultaneous with the default setup modifying process, so that the user can confirm whether the printing is made according to the modified contents of the default setup or whether the modified contents of the default setup are appropriate through actual prints (see paragraph [0052] of the specification as filed).

The Office Action acknowledges that the combination of Nishide and McIntyre fails to disclose the claimed printing unit, but asserts that the printing unit is disclosed by Shima. However, Shima simply discloses a process for printing a test page after print information is transmitted to a printer (see col. 3, lines 18-23 and col. 14, lines 5-18 of Shima). Shima does not disclose printing test print image data *during a default setup process* as defined in the independent claims at issue here. Further, Broeksteeg fails to cure the deficiencies of Nishide, McIntyre and Shima. Broeksteeg simply discloses that a default language can be one of the settings specified in a default setting (see lines 30-34 of paragraph [0006] of the reference).

Thus, the combination of Nishide, McIntyre, Shima and Broeksteeg fails to disclose or suggest a default setup modifying unit that executes a **default setup process** in which the default setup modifying unit modifies the multiple items of the default setting to create a modified default setting set forth in the single default setup command when the single default setup command is included in the printing job, and a printing unit that prints the test print image data included in the printing job **during the default setup process** as recited in independent Claim 1, and similarly recited in independent Claims 4, 5, 12 and 21. Thus, independent Claims 1, 4, 5, 12 and 21 are patentable over the combination of Nishide, McIntyre, Shima and Broeksteeg for at least the above reasons.

Claims 10, 18, 20 and 22 are patentable over Nishide, McIntyre, Shima and Broeksteeg at least by virtue of their dependence from the respective patentable independent claims. Thus, a detailed discussion of the additional distinguishing features recited in these dependent claims is not set forth at this time. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects Claims 7, 11, 14 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the combination of Nishide, McIntyre, Shima and Broeksteeg, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,963,414 to Iguchi. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Iguchi fails to overcome the deficiencies of Nishide, McIntyre, Shima and Broeksteeg. Therefore, Claims 7, 11, 14 and 19 are patentable over the applied references at least by virtue of their dependence from the respective patentable independent claims. Thus, a detailed discussion of the additional distinguishing features recited in these dependent claims is not set forth at this time. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application or should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application the undersigned respectfully requests that he be contacted at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,
BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: October 22, 2010

By: /David R. Kemeny/
David R. Kemeny
Registration No. 57241

Customer No. 21839
703 836 6620